

REMARKS

Claims 7, 31-34, and 38 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 8, 35, and 37 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-6, 8-30, and 35-37 remain pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6, 8-30, and 35-37 under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by NAI and Staggs.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. With respect to claim 1, NAI and Staggs describe a software product named “CyberCop Sting” which provides limited emulation of a virtual network on a single server or workstation. CyberCop Sting uses a single network interface to emulate a virtual network, with network addresses (e.g., IP addresses) associated with virtual systems on the virtual network all being routed to the same network interface. See Staggs, p. 1, second paragraph of text, describing “NT Sting Box” as being “single homed” and having a “sole NIC” [network interface card] that is the “REAL and ONLY real NIC” on the box. By contrast, claim 1 recites “routing the user to a network interface associated with the selected generated content set”, “wherein each generated content set is associated with one or more network interfaces associated only with that generated content set.” Support for the amendment to claim 1 may be found, without limitation, in the application at page 46, lines 1-10, and Figure 15. As described in the application, associating one or more network interfaces with each cage facilitates creation and maintenance of the cage environment and prevents the intruder from detecting that he is in a cage. Application at page 46, lines 7-10 Since the product described by NAI and Staggs uses only one network interface to emulate a virtual network, claim 1 is believed to be allowable over NAI and Staggs.

Claims 2-6 and 8-30 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Like claim 1, claim 35 recites a system “wherein each generated content set is associated with one or more network interfaces associated only with that generated content set.” As such, claim 35 is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 36 depends from claim 35 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Like claim 1, claim 37 recites a computer program product “wherein each generated content set is associated with one or more network interfaces associated only with that generated content set.” As such, claim 35 is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



William J. James
Registration No. 40,661
V 408-973-2592
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT AND YI, LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014